Dear Jim,

The reason I had to take my own curbstone picture is that Shaneyfelt's was shall I say creative? It was intended to obscure what he had to have seen immediately, the change in both texture and color where that impact was. The print you sent me includes neither so I believe it was made from a different part of the area in his picture.

The FBI had no need to do anything to that curbstone once it was patched. The patching accomplished what the FBI would have wanted to do if it did not in fact do the patching. Knowing there had been that patch it then went ahead and tested the patch, knowing it was perpetrating a fraud.

So, I see no purpose in doing anything other than what the FBI said it did, scrape a sample for testing. It in fact scraped the entire surface, it stated, and I believe that served its purpose, which included not leaving any of the surface for any possible later testing.

In short, I believe that what you plan is at the least a waste of time and money and in the end may be more than that. It is important not to give it anything it can latch onto. It then often does that and has that accepted a typical when it is not.

In your thinking, please try, before you spend any money on any lab work or get yourself involved in any futility, to come up with some FBI Lab purpose in doing what you believe left what you see there. Without any such purpose it it not really reasonable to believe that the FBI did it and more, to say that it did. They just do not do what can make troubke for themselves without a reason that for them is a good reason.

Their interest was in not having any remnant of that impact to test and the patching accomplished that for them. So there really was nothing more they had to do with that curbstone.

They had to get rid of the spectro plate and that they did did and that they got away with.

Anything else meant trouble and when they did all of this to avoid trouble they were not about to make it for themselves. Or give anyone a basis for that.

Also please try to understand that it was not Hoover telling the Commission anything. Those letters were written for his signature but I've sure were drafted in the lab and by Shaneyfelt. The basis for stating that it was a mutilated bullet is merely that the spectro showed no copper, which a bullet jacket would have shown. But it likewise is not possible that the jacket was shed with enough energy to get the core down there and chip that much out of the concrete. There is no proof. It is an interpretation that the FBI knew was

s deception because it know that what it tested was not the impact. They knew it was pasthed.

Remember also that they are talking in terms of that Mannlicher-Carcanno ammo only, whether or not they say it. I do not know the basis for their saying the full bullet would have made more of a hole. It might be true. But then again, a smaller caliber bullet could have been used and that would not have made as large a hole. Also, Shaneyfelt was careful not to have anything that gave the original bullet hole any dimension from the Dillard of Underwood pix.

Try and think this through before you get involved in what you have yet to show any FBI need to do. And try to show why they would do what they have no need to do so you can better uhderstand what I'm trying to say.

There is little doubt that the FBI knew that rifle had not been used in the shooting and could not have been. This is the actual official evidence, not the false official representation of the official evidence. It also is what the FBI had to obscure or hide. What it did in handling that curbstone was only what it had to do and no more. It was lucky to get away with what it did. It would not have created any other problems for itself.

Without some real need. This is why I asked you their purpose, that you think about this.

Best,

Harold